



MAYOR'S GREEN RIBBON COMMISSION ON CLIMATE PROTECTION
Thursday, September 22 -- 8:30 – 12:00
REI Conference Room (222 Yale Avenue North, 2nd Floor)

MEETING SUMMARY

PROCESS

- GRC agrees we need a November meeting. November 18 does not work for Denis Hayes; November 14 is the date selected.
- GRC agrees that February 2006 is a better timeframe for submittal of final recommendations/report—Denis is out of the country from February through March 6, so we will aim for mid-March.
- OSE will attempt to capture more GRC feedback via a homework assignment.
- GRC recommends that we begin drafting sections of report as soon as possible for two reasons: 1) it's easier to react to something in writing; 2) we must be careful not to wait until the last minute and rush to finish an unsatisfactory product.

CRITERIA

- GRC came to general agreement on the three criteria: greenhouse gas emissions reduction potential; feasibility; and catalytic potential.
- GRC agrees with added emphasis on emissions reductions before 2012, but wants to include longer-term actions that need attention now to be successful beyond 2012. A sort of actions by timeframe is suggested.
- Late in the meeting, two GRC members suggested making equity a sorting criterion, i.e., promotes vs. reduces social justice, does not put unfair burden on lower-income people, etc. GRC needs to discuss further how to integrate equity issues and concerns into its recommendations.

MEASURING OUR PROGRESS – METRICS

- GRC agrees with proposed metrics, for the most part. While there was some concern that tracking per-capita emissions would undermine an absolute target, the GRC is okay with including it.
- GRC members would like proposed metrics in a few additional areas: clean vehicles and fuels (e.g., gasoline consumption, biofuels or hybrid sales), livability (e.g., amount and access to green space), and economic opportunity (e.g., job creation in clean technology). In addition, the Commission would like us to explore other indicators of transit-oriented development (e.g., land-use code and/or permitting changes that facilitate TOD).

- We need to add one or more additional metrics that speak to the public, and tell a story, e.g., metrics related to public health, jobs and/or livability
- Metrics should be tracked annually if possible; gas/emissions inventory every three years (PSCAA will revisit how fuel sales data are collected to allow more detail).

SOLUTIONS : TRANSPORTATION

- **General**
 - Packaging the recommendations into five strategies works well
 - Need to focus more on how to implement and fund these ideas
 - Ideas that consistently came up as “more promising”: 1) fully funding and implementing the Seattle Transit Plan, 2) climate-friendly parking policies (including pricing), 3) road pricing, 4) aggressive promotion of clean cars and clean fuels, 5) significantly improved conditions for walking and biking, and 6) pushing even harder on transit-oriented development.
- **Transit/Seattle Transit Plan**
 - Needs major funding attention and further investigation for funding possibilities.
 - Local infrastructure (bike, pedestrian, road, transit) should be on the same tier as larger regional projects (the viaduct, bridges).
 - SDOT and OSE should coordinate on work already underway to identify revenue sources, as there was a strong interest in creating a dedicated funding source.
- **Parking**
 - Make it expensive! Some believe Seattle parking is far too cheap and plentiful
 - Max/min parking limits can be controversial to some, but may be necessary. Can frame to them as enhancing walkability/livability.
 - Eliminating free parking in urban areas should be looked at.
- **Road pricing**
 - Needs GRC attention in moving forward.
 - Should be used to fund transit and get same priority as capital projects.
- **Clean fleets and fuels**
 - Green fleets (public, private, rental, state-wide), emissions-based registrations, and feebates need further attention
 - Electrification of transportation and renewable fuels use needs greater attention—Port equipment, cruise ships, bus/trolley expansion.
 - Any fleet conversion should be high priority.
- **Bike and ped**
 - Should be on the same tier as large projects like the viaduct; bike/ped/transit infrastructure needs transformation.
 - Bike parking and showers need more investigation as part of building standards or zoning.
 - Safe routes to school... safe routes to everywhere! Needs more attention, as ~¼ of streets have no sidewalks.
 - Bike lanes on major arterials would “complete the streets”.
- **PAYD**
 - Should consider payment at the pump (like Hawaii?).

- **Taxis**

- Perhaps look into creating incentives for taxi use as an alternative to private car use
- General support for efforts to convert taxis to cleaner vehicles/fuels.
- Some concern/discussion about revisiting historically contentious issues like the deadheading requirement and which fuels are most promising (CNG, hybrid, ethanol).
- Taxi issues, given complexity, should be separate and possibly identified in different time frames: 1) deadheading, 2) conversion of fleets through contracts, and 3) regionalization.

- **New Ideas**

- Transit operations should be better consolidated, possibly creating a single regional entity. Views on this were mixed; we need to look at the GHG reduction benefits of consolidation
- Rental fleet fuel efficiency initiative.
- Can we better utilize communication technology (e.g., Wi-Fi and W-Max) to supplant car trips?
- Should the GRC weigh in on “major projects” like the viaduct replacement and bridge redevelopment (SR 520 and I-90), from a climate perspective? Taking away capacity—like the viaduct—is good for CO2 reductions, in general. Investigate San Francisco’s downtown route that was not replaced after earthquake and Portland’s McCall Park—what were CO2 benefits? Consider freight implications.
- Investigate Denver’s central light rail-only route with TOD.

SOLUTIONS : ENERGY

- **New Ideas**

Various Commissioners identified the need to:

- Decouple utilities revenues and profits from efficiency programs, otherwise there’s a built-in disincentive to aggressively promote the use of less of the utility’s profit.
 - Align building owners/operators and occupants, so there’s a clear link between the costs and benefits of increased efficiency (i.e., increased capital costs up-front vs. lower energy bills over time). Determining how is difficult.
 - Require efficiency retrofits at property transfer (like they do with certified wood stoves).
 - Get the private sector more squarely behind voluntary green building standards.
 - Look at solar access codes so that when the technology is available the existing building stock can take advantage of it.
 - Do better with efficiency, which should constitute at least 1% of the total load (instead of current .7%)
 - Improve the successful Green up program so that it results in new renewable source development.
 - Repackage BOMA partnerships and building labeling as two separate actions.
- Question: should Seattle participate in the Chicago Climate Exchange?